

On April 28, 1994, two Philip Morris researchers, Victor DeNoble and Paul Mele, appeared before the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to testify about their research at Philip Morris from 1980 to 1984. They described how they used experimental techniques developed by the National Institute on Drug Abuse [NIDA] to determine the addiction potential of nicotine.

DeNoble and Mele's experiments primarily involved nicotine self-administration studies in rats. As described above, they found that rats would self-administer nicotine—one of the hallmark characteristics of an addictive drug.

DeNoble and Mele's work held great interest to top Philip Morris executives. According to their testimony, in mid-1983 they were flown to New York to brief senior management on their work. Then in November 1983, the President of Philip Morris, Shep Pollack, flew to Richmond to observe rats injecting nicotine in one of DeNoble and Mele's self-administration experiments. At that time, Pollack was informed by DeNoble that the procedures he observed were "the exact procedures NIDA would use to demonstrate abuse liability."

Despite Philip Morris's interest in their work, DeNoble and Mele were abruptly terminated in April 1984, due to concerns that their findings could bolster product liability claims against Philip Morris. Subsequently, Philip Morris threatened the two researchers with litigation if they disclosed their research activities in journals or at public forums.

DeNoble and Mele were involved in only one part of Philip Morris's intensive investigation of nicotine—the rat experimentation. Virtually nothing is known about what happened to the many other Philip Morris research initiatives after 1980.

#### CONCLUSION

The documents I have just read make it clear that Philip Morris is in the drug business. Its laboratories have been intensively involved in unlocking the secrets of nicotine pharmacology for decades. The documents themselves state that this pharmacological research was undertaken for commercial purposes.

The documents also indicate that this research was in important instances targeted specifically at children and college students.

In summary, these documents make it crystal clear that we need regulation of tobacco to protect our children from becoming addicted to a life-threatening drug.

Mr. Speaker, I have brought with me the documents I read from during the course of this hour. Pursuant to my earlier unanimous consent request, I am inserting the documents in the RECORD for publication.

[Documents referred to will appear in a future issue of the RECORD.]

□ 1315

#### SALUTE TO POLICE OFFICERS IN AUSTIN, TX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized until 2 p.m.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, thank heavens there are young men and women across this country who are willing to dedicate their lives to protecting the rest of us, who help to secure us in our neighborhoods and our homes, who protect us against crime and violence and crimes of property.

I particularly want to salute and recognize some of the young men and women, and I have actually brought pictures of them here today, who joined the men and women in blue last Friday night in Austin, TX.

You will see each of them is actually in a tan or khaki uniform because these are their cadet pictures, and on Friday night, they graduated from being cadets in the Austin Police Department to serving now and are today, as I speak, many of them are out patrolling the streets and the sidewalks of the city of Austin, TX, assuring that the good citizens of our community can go about their lives and their livelihoods without the threat of violent crime.

Today in this House and throughout this week we are going to have an opportunity to back up these young men and women who are out there patrolling our streets or to abandon our commitment to them. And it is the concept of community policing and the important vote that this House will take this week when it takes under consideration the appropriations bill for the COPS Program that I wanted to address this afternoon.

You see, this particular class of young men and women is the largest class that we have had in Austin, TX, for some time, because it includes some 63 young men and women who have dedicated themselves to the protection of their neighbors there in central Texas, and the only reason that the class can include 63 cadets, now 63 new law enforcement officers in Austin, TX, is because of the backup of the Federal Government.

Of course, law enforcement must always be principally a local responsibility, and we are fortunate in Austin, TX, to have one of the finest law enforcement agencies in this entire country under the command of our chief of police, Elizabeth Watson.

In order to back up that strong local initiative, in recognizing our local communities are many times strapped for tax resources, the Federal Government can provide some support, not only through an occasional speech on the floor of the Congress or from the White House but actually by putting dollars where the Federal mouth is, and in this case something was done right by this Federal Government and something was done right on the floor

of this House last September when a new crime offensive was approved by the House, over tremendous opposition, and that bill was signed into law, and within little more than a month of the time that that bill became law late last October, the city of Austin learned that it could go out and would have the Federal support, the Federal moneys that 25 of these 63 young men and women would be paid for through Federal tax dollars through the COPS Program.

We have had a real interest in Austin, TX, in community policing because we realize that getting our law enforcement officers into the community, knowing the people in the neighborhoods, backing up Neighborhood Watch, backing up crime stoppers, using every tool available to involve law enforcement officers with the neighborhoods in doing effective community policing was the best way to do something about the rising tide of crime that we had faced in Austin, TX.

So within a month of Congress acting, little more than a month, the city of Austin, like communities across this great land, learned that there would be Federal dollars to back up local efforts and to add new cadets to the training course. Come January of this year, our cadets began a very rigorous training that is done right there in Travis County, TX.

Last Friday night they completed that training and are now out serving.

But what an unusual coincidence, I must say, it is this week, just as these cadets hit the street and began protecting our citizenry, that we are faced with a critical vote that will probably come up tomorrow night or Wednesday morning in the Justice Department appropriations, and if that bill is approved in the form that is recommended to this House for action, we will yield in our support to these young men and women. We will be saying to communities across the country that the commitment to add 100,000 new law enforcement officers to our Nation's streets is a commitment that this Congress does not intend to fulfill.

I think that would be a serious mistake. That is why I want to draw attention to that appropriations bill this afternoon and particularly to an amendment that I believe will be offered by our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], to restore support for the same program that has added these young men and women to our streets.

It is ironic that a group of people, our Republican colleagues who refer to themselves frequently at campaign time as law and order supporters, would be withdrawing support from the very program that put these people on the street.

You see, the administration backed the initiative here in Congress and signed it into law to get 100,000 new police officers on the street. But the bill that passed this Congress earlier in the year and the appropriations measure,

instead of backing up our law enforcement officers, takes away the commitment of 100,000 new police and substitutes something that I guess you would have to call a blob grant because no longer do we stand by our commitment of 100,000 new officers. Rather, we say we are going to transfer to the States and localities a blob of Federal money that can be used for a variety of things.

Under the legislation passed, and as it would be funded as an alternative to actually putting law enforcement officers on the street, is an incredible amount of new bureaucracy. In this particular case, the reason the city of Austin was able to move so fast as communities across our country have done so is because all it had to do is file a simple application. It did not have to go through the bureaucracy of the State of Texas and get that bureaucracy involved in evaluating its application. It could come directly to the source of the money, and I know that that has been true in other States.

I see the gentlewoman from Colorado. I am sure you have had that experience in Colorado.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Not only have we had that experience, no one can believe it is a one-page form. I mean it is a one-page form which is historic, I think, in this Federal bureaucracy that we have, and I find that my city of Denver has had the same experience yours has had.

We, first of all, feel very lucky that we live in the country where people call the police and call the police with great trust and, in fact, want more police because they feel the more police that are around, the safer the streets are going to be. You and I could stand here and name a lot of other countries where the last thing you might want to do is call the police. But here they call the police. They want the police.

In my city of Denver, having police on the beat, having police on the street, having police in the neighborhoods has just been a very exciting program and has truly remarkably reduced crime in 1 year. We saw it go down over 7 percent in 1 year.

It used to be every year we sat around waiting for those statistics to come out, wringing our hands, thinking how much worse is it going to get this year. But with these new police officers that we got funded, we are beginning to see a turnaround. We want it to go lower, of course. Of course, we do.

But I think what the gentleman is talking about is if we create this whole new tier of bureaucracy, if we go back to business as usual with the big complex form or if we allow the State to control the funds, we are not going to have this direct action, this fast action, this rapid action to get help to the cities, and they are the ones that are on the front line in most of this.

Mr. DOGGETT. I really appreciate the gentlewoman's observation because

while I focused, naturally, on my community in central Texas, this is really just an example of what has been happening throughout this country.

As you know, I am new here to Washington. I think it is truly amazing from the time that you and others provided the leadership in this Congress to pass this bill and then it got signed, over this tremendous objection that you had, so many roadblocks and obstacles thrown up by what was at that time a Republican minority, the President signed the bill in September. By late October, cities across the country know they will have money coming, and here, 10 months later, we have across the country almost 3,000 new officers that are on the street. That is a Federal bureaucracy that was actually working the way it is supposed to: lean. It gets its office set up, gets any regulations it needs set up, and you actually have under the program that Austin and Denver benefited from, already 3,000 new officers; and in our smaller cities of under 100,000 there are almost 5,000 new officers under the COPS Ahead program; and still under another program of the COPS Fast program, which, I believe, is the one actually targeted at the smallest communities, there are about 7,000 officers that have come on there.

So that is the Federal Government for once operating the way it is supposed to do: getting a program started and actually getting the officers on the beat.

□ 1330

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield further, in my locality we were very fortunate also in that we are one of four areas in the country where they have experimented with something called Project Pat. As my colleague knows, Attorney General Reno had been a local law enforcement officer, so she understands these layers of bureaucracy, and, when my district kind of exploded in crime, she was very sympathetic and said, "Let me try and get the State, the Federal Government, and the city government in the same room, and let them be planning from all agencies, all agencies of all levels, to make sure there isn't duplication, that they can respond rapidly, and they can really get funds out quickly to wherever there appears to be a problem," and, believe me, that has worked tremendously, too. We had a very quiet summer in Denver because of that type of response, whereas the summer before had been a great tragic one of day after day no one wanting to watch the news because if it bleeds, it leads, and there was a whole lot of bleeding, and it was almost the entire news hour.

So what I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is worried about and what I am worried about is what we are apt to see when we take up this appropriations bill is really undoing the ability of the Federal Government to do that, that they are going to

strike these funds, take away the sugar, and take away the ability to come forward with this very distinguished new group that you are so proud of. This is the new group that just graduated in Austin.

Mr. DOGGETT. This is just Friday night, and ironically they will begin their service this week on the very week that our Republican colleagues proposed to just pull away this entire commitment to 100,000 new police officers across the street. Twenty-five of these young men and women were funded through Federal dollars, and you know you have raised, as you so often do here on the floor of Congress, a very important point in referring to Attorney General Janet Reno and her experience in law enforcement because when I have talked, not just to these young men and women, but to our existing Austin Police Department officers, to law enforcement organizations around the country, I do not find any law enforcement experts coming forward and saying, "Junk this program that is actually providing us support."

Rather I find them agreeing with our chief of police in Austin, Elizabeth Watson, and I know the gentlewoman will be pleased to know that our leader in the law enforcement office in Austin is a woman who is doing an outstanding job in law enforcement. She said that these neighborhood enforcement teams that have been packed up with Federal dollars will really make a difference, and she is saying the same thing I am sure you hear in Denver, that I have heard from the various law enforcement organizations that have come before the committee on which you serve that have come here for press conferences here at the Capitol saying, "Please continue to lend us the support; this program works," but for some unfortunate partisan political reasons, just as this program begins to get the law enforcement officers on the street, our Republican colleagues want to jerk the rug out from under this program.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, if the gentleman would yield, I think that is exactly what is happening, and unfortunately I hope by the end of the week what we are worried about has not come true.

But my police chief, David Rochard, is wonderful. He is very distinguished. He is in the National Cities or the Great Cities Police Chiefs League. I met with him a couple of weeks ago, and he was very distressed. He said this is the first group, meaning the new leadership in this Congress, that would not meet with the chiefs from the large cities in America. They have been banging on the door. Usually they say everybody is trying to get a hold of the police chiefs, and I would think you would want to talk to the police chiefs first. They are on the front line, they are the ones having to deal with this rising crime, and, if we are going to try to do something for them, we ought to ask them what would work the best,

and, as he said during the crime bill, they were consulted constantly by the administration and by the then majority in Congress. But they have not been able to break through the door and get into to see anyone here. Not only have they not been asked, they cannot get in when they ask to get in.

He also was very upset; as my colleague knows, last week we saw this body cut back severely the funds that were to go for the violence against women, and again America's police chiefs have been saying young people are learning violence in a classroom, in their living room. They are learning it right at home, and they need that violence against women money to put in the hot line, to have more shelters, to do training of judges and police officers as to how to treat this and to get at that. Well, of course, that got gutted last week, and if this week you go after the police officers that we are now getting out on the street, we used ours through community policing, and I assume, I am not sure that is what Austin is—

Mr. DOGGETT. Indeed we do, and you make such a vital point about the Violence Against Women Act portion of this. If I understand this same bill, it essentially eliminated all of the funding for the excellent work that you and your colleagues did last year in establishing a violence against women portion, a tremendous portion and a tremendous advance in this same piece of legislation, and about the only thing they left in the appropriation was the hotline for women who are abused and are the victims of violence to call in, and so the question that we have here today is whether, when they call in, there will be a law enforcement officer there to meet their calls along with the counselors, and our battered-women centers, and groups that work against violence, but will there be a law enforcement officer, or will all of the support for Federal support for law enforcement officers be pulled away and denied to communities across this country to support women who are the victims of violence and people across our society that suffer from either physical violence or crimes of property.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, if the gentleman would further yield, I am so glad you stood up and are talking about this.

You were not here in the last term, but in the last term the Violence Against Women Act passed 411 to zero, 411 to zero. Now it is hard to get a larger mandate than that, even though the crime bill was a lot closer, but 411 to zero, and 1 year later the new majority feels perfectly able to go in and gut it even though many of them voted for it, and I think you are going to find exactly the same thing with police officers.

Show me a person who would not like to have more police officers in their neighborhood. They would. And we had a long 2-year dialog about this with At-

torney General Reno, with police chiefs and everybody. They said this is now the money could be used the best. So we got going, we fast-forwarded, we made the form simple, and we did have some moderate Republicans join us. That is how we got the bill out of here finally. We were all excited, and now they have done to that—or they appear to be going to do to that what they did to the Violence Against Women Act last week, so I am so pleased that the gentleman is down here pointing this out.

Let us hope, if anyone is watching, it will be, Wake up America; no one is really safe. You think everyone is against crime, but they may not be for funding anything or really helping communities trying to fight crime.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for that observation and would add one other aspect of this, that seeing our colleague from California [Mr. MILLER] here, I know it is particularly important in California, but it is important in San Antonio, TX, as well, and that is that under this cops program one of the programs that is very important is the Troops to Cops Program. That is taking people who are leaving our military, who have obtained training in security as military police and other aspects of the military and channeling their skills into law enforcement and particularly in parts of our country that have had recent base closings. I would think there would be particular support for this Troops to Cops Program, and what an extraordinarily ill-timed initiative by our Republican colleagues to come in and gut this cops program at the very time that it could turn to those who will be leaving some of our military bases and help them get on the streets to make our—they have done a great job in protecting our national security, but now they can help us with our neighborhood security.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to thank the gentleman for taking this time to call attention to the concerns we have about the appropriations bills that come to the floor and the reduction of the cops portion of that bill.

I represent two communities in my district that were among—had among the highest crime rates in California, and unfortunately one of them had among the highest homicide rates in the State of California. But of those communities qualified for Federal moneys to expand their police forces, to expand the cops on the beat or to participate in the Cops on the Beat Program. Both of them used it for the purposes of community policing, along with the sheriff's agency in one of the countries that I represent, but in these two communities I have traveled with the police during the day, talked to the officers on the beat, and seen a remarkable, remarkable change in attitude as this money has allowed the police de-

partments to expand into the communities.

In one case in Vallejo, CA, they have used them for a bicycle patrol within the commercial districts, and helping out the transit districts as large numbers of young people get out of school during a particular time during the day, and also used them for evening drug patrols, and drug activity has plummeted, the homicide rate is down considerably. They have been able to literally ride down and capture more individuals engaged in drug-related activity because they have been able to move along the railroad tracks, over hill, over dale, and also, as they point out, to very often surprise drug deals because they are just not cognizant that these bicycles coming down the road are police officers. In Richmond, CA, they have used the officers on the beat again to make it safer for retail businesses to have people shop on foot, to come back downtown, to participate in the community. They have used it to patrol the housing projects, again bringing about a reduction in criminal activity. They have also related very strongly that they have—this money and this cops program has allowed them to spend additional time with some of the gang-related activities that we have experienced in both of these communities, and in one of the communities we have again seen a reduction in the gang violence.

This summer so far has been much different than the summer a year ago and a year and a half ago, and we hope that we will be able to continue that effort. Of course now the mayors of those cities and the city councils are concerned that either they are going to renege on these contracts for cops on the beat or they will not have the availability to try and reapply should that funding be available beyond the contract period.

We should not, we should not, diminish the success that we have, and we should not yank away these resources from the communities, whether it is in Austin, or in Colorado, in Boulder and Denver, elsewhere where I think we have shared these kind of experiences. The returns are just now starting to come in as these communities have been able to participate in this program, and for the Republicans now, almost what seems like almost spite because of the success of this program, because this program, I think, was successful for the administration, but they thought it up, they executed it, they got the money on the street, that now there is some desire just to whack this money, and it is going to be a terrible blow to the local law enforcement, certainly to community policing in many, many communities that desperately need this money and really do not have the wherewithal to replace it, and I want to commend the gentleman and thank him for taking this time and the gentlewoman from Colorado for participating in this.

Mr. DOGGETT. I appreciate your comments. As you know, one of the really good points about this program is, if you have a community of 100,000 or less, the entire application process is filling out one piece of paper and sending it directly to Washington. And what a contrast, as the gentleman knows, between that effective program and this new block grant program that the Republicans want to substitute. I note particularly, and I think this could have a particularly negative effect in California, that under their block grant program the Governor of the State has not less than 45 days to review and comment on the application. That is not true under existing law. Your cities found out within 45 days of the President signing the law that the money was on the way. I do not know in California if Governor Wilson would even have time to look at the application since he is off and about the country.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman would yield, yes, we would not want to do that with an absentee Governor like we have now, but more importantly, our communities were able to take their circumstances, their crime rate, their concern about youth gang activities, and in the city of Richmond, the city of Vallejo, that have been suffering under increasing crime rates, they were able to take that situation, make this application, and very quickly determine whether or not they would be qualified for the first- or second-round grants that were made, and the fact of the matter is the money is now in the police department where it belongs, it is not being argued about within the city council over some other kind of way they can sneak out that block-grant money and use it for some other purposes.

□ 1345

It is in the police department, it is being directed at crime, and the results are coming in in terms of a diminishing crime rate in two communities, both Vallejo, CA, and Richmond, CA, that were having a real rough time fighting crime. They do not need the Governor's involvement. They do not need Congress' involvement. What they need is communications between the Justice Department and their own situation and a quick determination of whether or not they qualify or not.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman would yield, that is one of the things my communities have been very excited about. They have never seen such customer service relations as on this. One-page form, goes immediately, you put in a coupon and get an electronic transfer of the funds to your own bank. It is up and going.

I am a little fascinated that if this works so well, and if this is what the police chiefs want, and if it is so tremendously user friendly, why is everybody out to kill it this week?

Mr. DOGGETT. It is really extraordinary. I know the gentlewoman served

on the committee that reviewed some of this legislation. Did the gentlewoman hear any good reason advanced for why a program that is putting young men and women like this on streets across this country, why we should pull the rug out from under that program and say that we need the Pete Wilsons and the George Bushes and the Governors and the State bureaucracies suddenly getting in the way of a program that takes money directly from Washington and puts it onto the streets and sidewalks of our communities across the country?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, if the gentleman will yield, no, I did not hear any good response to that. Obviously, there are certain people who are totally into the punishment mode rather than prevention. I think the American people would much prefer a crime that is prevented.

Now, if it happens, then, yes, they are into punishment. But this was seen more as on the prevention side and they thought that that was soft, warm, fuzzy. I do not think so. I think the American people would much prefer a tough prevention program with cops on the beat and cops on the street. That is what they want to see. We got that, but for those who are still trying to say the Federal Government's role is only in prisons and only after they have been caught, we are in trouble.

I think one of the things we have all found is, first of all, block grants are not going to work well for any of our States, because if your population is growing, the funding is going to be on your old population. So some State is going to get your money where the people have left and moved into your State.

The next thing you are going to see is that people are going to try and knock this out. When cities start getting into trouble with crime, then the city starts getting hurt economically. The more it hurts economically, the less it has of its own money to get more police officers. So this is a way to help them get police officers, get back on their feet economically, and get people not worried about the crime rate and moving back in.

If you take this all away, we are back to where we were. Once communities get on that slippery slope of rising crime, they can be in real trouble and you can end up with an abandoned city.

Mr. MILLER of California. The genesis of this program was this was about putting police officer resources on the street, not about initiating a debate in city councils or boards of supervisors and the State legislature about what to do with a block grant form of money. This was about getting officers on the street to deal with the community.

I would suggest that our Republican colleagues ought to spend some time riding with these officers, walking with these officers, visiting the communities, talking to the merchants who for the first time feel comfortable in their communities because they know

that these officers are around and about.

Many people lament the loss of community, the way it used to be. Well, the way it used to be was the people knew the police officers on the beat. They trusted them, they knew them, they could report activity to them. That, once again, in the communities I represent is returning. When I went around and talked to the merchants in Richmond, when I went around in Vallejo and talked to the merchants, they said yes, now they knew that sometime during the day this officer would be there. They felt free to talk to them. To say gee, there are these groups congregating on the corner, causing trouble, could you do this, look into it, do that. That is how we police our communities.

I think the point was that is what this was directed at. The block grant suggested there is some greater law enforcement decision to be made out there, and that we will let that open debate and let communities do what they wanted. The fact of the matter is what local communities wanted were officers, police personnel, on the streets. If they think this is warm and fuzzy, they ought to talk to the criminals that have been run down by community police officers in the commission of an act of crime and brought to justice. That was not very warm and fuzzy, but they were available, where in the past they have not been.

Mr. DOGGETT. Or as you wisely suggest, to simply ride with, to walk on the beat with, our law enforcement officers. When I have done that, I have had the same experience as the gentleman from California. You talk to the young man or woman who is out there on the beat, standing between us and violent crime, protecting our businesses, protecting our neighborhoods and our families and their dwellings. They are not interested in having to get immersed in city politics. They sure do not want to have to go to the governor and ask if more police is okay. They do not care whether Republicans or Democrats or President Clinton or President somebody else takes credit. They just need help.

What this piece of legislation that we will vote on tomorrow night does is it pulls that help away and says we will not stand with them against crime. We are going to immerse them in the very kind of politics that they asked not to be immersed in, instead of backing them up and lending them the support they need to protect communities, whether it is in California, Colorado, or Austin, TX, or anywhere else in this great land.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. One of the ways it worked in my community, which has been wonderful, is the police have opened a neighborhood office. All the merchants and local people are invited in. The community gets a dinner. It just opens up the whole community, and they have done a much better job of catching criminals. If you look at

the bottom line, one of the reasons there is a lot of crime is a lot of people got away with it.

Well, if you have them there and you have eyes and ears and people know where to call and know it is right nearby in their neighborhood, boy, that stops the nonsense. And our biggest problem has been people wanting more, more, more. We cannot get enough fast enough.

I am sure they are going to be stunned to find out that we may vote this out tomorrow, that this may be voted out, because, listen, they do not have R's on their shirts. There is no R for Republican, no D for Democrat, no C for Clinton. They are police officers. They are out there to protect the community.

The gentleman was talking a little earlier about the Troops to Cops. That was in my committee. I worked very hard to get that amendment through and cosponsored it. What a waste. Some of these young people have already been perfectly trained. They just need a little extra training and they are ready to go on the civilian side. It is a win-win for the taxpayer. You paid for their military training. You may as well transfer it to the civilian side and keep it going.

I think there were so many things we were starting to make headway on, and I do not care, the people in my district do not care, whether it is Republicans or Democrats. Their No. 1 issue is get crime under control and stop the killing and stop the terror. This is the best way.

They are not saying what we want is get as many prisons as you can shoe-horn in here and let us stuff everybody in prison. Yes, if you catch people, they want them to go to prison, but they much prefer preventing it in the first instance, so they are free to walk around on the streets and enjoy the community that they used to be able to enjoy.

So I think your bringing this to the floor is absolutely essential. I cannot wait to see what they come up with as a reason to kill this program. I know we will all be listening intently.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from California have both referenced prevention. I also wonder whether anyone is trying to undermine this cops program has ever discussed prevention with young men and women like this or with their older peers who are out there and have served our community, in some cases for decades.

I know, for example, that in my community of Austin, TX, you mentioned this community meeting, last year we had a real problem in one neighborhood particularly, it has unfortunately affected a great deal of our community, with youth violence. So instead of looking only at the question of violence, our forward looking police department under Chief Watson sees leadership.

One of the things they did about crime was to set up a job fair, to actu-

ally pull in local businesses to a high school, not far from this community. I went out to that job fair and there were young people coming out the doors, and there were some business people who I am sure instead of having someone who might come in and shoplift, someone who might some day because of drugs be burglarizing their establishment, they found a willing worker. Because if we provide some of these young people hope and we provide them opportunity, and if they begin to recognize that the men and women who go through cadet school and put on their blue uniform and go out to defend us are on our side, they are not the enemy, they are there working in the community with community police stations, with community prevention programs that work to try to prevent crime, that try to deter crime, and in turn, of course, unfortunately, when that does not work to a prison system to back them up, which we need. But if we rely only on the steel bars, we cannot build the prisons fast enough to fulfill the need of our community for security.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to thank the gentleman and just say we found at least some of the officers have been more involved in community policing than just their shift work. We find them involved with the young people they work with in an official capacity during the day, on the weekends, and on their own time developing programs of community service for these people, completely voluntary, only recreational activities.

This summer, at the end of the summer, we will for the second time have a police officer-inspired program in which young people have done service in their community and will be treated to a field trip. It is a huge event in a community that is very poor, lives in public housing, but by having all of the kids participate throughout the summer and stay engaged, this officer has put together the resources to then take them on a field trip of recreation and fun, something that we would have never seen because of the walls that are traditionally being built between the community and law enforcement.

But now, because of her involvement in this community on a day-to-day basis, walking, talking to their mothers, their fathers, and other young people in the community, we now see this kind of relationship being built which we think long term will help law enforcement. As these young people grow up, it will also build some confidence in law enforcement by these young people because they will know these officers personally, and we like to believe that will continue. But for the first time we are now seeing a downward trend in crime in our communities.

I hope we can defeat these efforts to take away this funding.

Mr. DOGGETT. In attempting to do that, let me bring to the attention of the House one other aspect of this cops

program, and that is something called cops more.

Again, it is ironic that this very week, probably by midweek, the administration, the Department of Justice, will be announcing cops more grants. Hopefully, the city of Austin will be one of those and cities across this country. That is money that does allow some flexibility.

It will, for example, provide Federal dollars, again, directly to the city of Austin, to other communities, to allow some of our law enforcement officers that are now tied up with paperwork and other duties within the station to be replaced with civilian workers so that those skilled law enforcement officers can be out on the street. It will allow for the paying of overtime when our police officers are stretched to the limits at times and have to have overtime. It will allow for certain equipment to be purchased to facilitate police communications and other activities on the street.

So the cops program, as the Congress approved it last year, has the necessary flexibility already not only to get 100,000 police officers on the street, but to give them the tools that they need to be effective. Not politics, but real law enforcement tools, and that program will be announcing grants across America this week.

Yet, unfortunately, it is that very program that the House will undermine and destroy tomorrow night, unless we are able to get an amendment on changing the appropriations bill as it has been recommended and keep the support for our local law enforcement agencies.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, let me thank him one more time for so very articulately laying out what our choices are going to be this week.

Let me end the way I began. I feel so fortunate to live in a country where people call the police, are not afraid of the police, and see the police as their friend, and they really want us to help fund more of them to help bring our communities back to the way they were. Just as we were beginning to get that going, we do not want to see the rug pulled out from under us. Thank you so much.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for her observations and comments.

I would just close in saying that crime is not like the weather. There is something that we can do about it. The "something" this week in the House is to stand behind the men and women who just graduated from the academy in Austin, TX, that are out there because of Federal dollars, and keep that program going, backing up our law enforcement agencies, not substituting some weird blob grant program, but standing behind the men and women who are protecting our neighborhoods, our homes and businesses, doing something about crime with a program that

works today, right now. Keep that program and defeat this reactionary change that has been proposed.

□ 1400

#### PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the Committee on the Judiciary.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVRETT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the Democratic leadership has been consulted and the ranking minority member of each of the committees the gentleman referred to.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### EXPORTS OF ALASKAN NORTH SLOPE OIL

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 197

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 70) to permit exports of certain domestically produced crude oil, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment,

the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. (a) After passage of H.R. 70, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 395 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, the motion to amend described in subsection (b). The motion to amend shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to amend and on the Senate bill without intervening motion except one motion to recommit the bill with or without instructions. If the motion to amend is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendments to S. 395 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

(b) The motion to amend the Senate bill made in order by subsection (a) is as follows:

"(1) Strike title I.

"(2) Strike sections 201 through 204 and insert the text of H.R. 70, as passed by the House.

"(3) Strike section 205.

"(4) Strike section 206.

"(5) Strike title III."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all the time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 197 is an open rule providing for 1 hour of

general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

House Resolution 197 authorizes the Chair to accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rule does not require preprinting, but simply encourages Members to take advantage of the option in order to facilitate consideration of amendments on the floor of the House.

This rule allows the chair to postpone votes in the Committee of the Whole and reduce votes to 5 minutes, if those votes follow a 15-minute vote. Finally, this resolution provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Section 2 of House Resolution 197 provides for the consideration of S. 395 in the House. All points of order against the Senate bill and its consideration are waived and it shall be in order to consider the motion to amend S. 395 as described in the rule. Additionally, this section provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the motion to amend is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendments to S. 395 and request a conference with the Senate.

The purpose of the underlying legislation, H.R. 70, is to lift the ban on the export of crude oil produced on Alaska's North Slope. This legislation was reported out of the Committee on Resources by voice vote and it has broad bipartisan support. This bill is clearly in the national interests, and by lifting the ban on exports, we can create tens of thousands of new jobs, drive domestic energy production, raise revenues, and reduce our dependence on imports. It is important to note that according to the Congressional Budget Office, H.R. 70 will reduce Federal outlays by about \$50 million over the next 5 years.

This open rule was reported out of the Rules Committee by voice vote. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with consideration of the merits of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information: